

## CHAPTER 9: CAPITAL FACILITIES AND FINANCING ELEMENT

I.	<b>Required Elements</b>	155
	<i>GMA Land Use Planning Goal</i>	
	<i>GMA Requirements For Land Use Planning</i>	
	<i>Countywide Planning Policies</i>	
II.	<b>Relationship To Other Plans</b>	156
III.	<b>Introduction</b>	157
IV.	<b>Provide An Adequate Level of Service</b>	158
V.	<b>Concurrency Requirements</b>	159
VI.	<b>Funding Options</b>	159
VII.	<b>Projections And Priorities For Future</b>	166
	<b>Improvements</b>	
VI.	<b>Capital Facilities Plan Goals And Policies</b>	167

### I. REQUIRED ELEMENTS

#### **GMA LAND USE PLANNING GOALS (RCW 36.70A.020)**

The Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) includes 14 goals, which were adopted to guide the development and adoption of comprehensive plans and development regulations. Land use policies and implementing regulations influence transportation, housing, economic development, property rights, permits, natural resource industries, open space and recreation, environment, citizen participation and coordination, public facilities and services, and historic preservation.

While all of these goals are important, the goal(s) that are most directly related to the capital facilities and financing element state:

*“Urban Growth. Encourage development in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner.”*

*Public Facilities and Services. Ensure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards.*

#### **GMA REQUIREMENTS FOR LAND USE PLANNING (RCW 36.70A.070)**

A capital facilities plan is one of the mandatory elements of the Comprehensive Plan required pursuant to the GMA. As prescribed by the GMA, the capital facilities plan element must consist of:

- 
- (a) An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities, showing the locations and capacities of the capital facilities;
  - (b) A forecast of the future needs for such capital facilities;
  - (c) The proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities;
  - (d) At least a six-year plan that will finance such capital facilities within the projected funding capacities and clearly identifies sources of public money for such purposes;
  - (e) A requirement to reassess the land use element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs and to ensure that the land use element, capital facilities plan element, and financing plan within the capital facilities plan element are coordinated and consistent. Park and recreation facilities shall be included in the capital facilities plan element.

## COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES

The Growth Management Act (GMA) was amended in 1991. This Amendment required each county legislative body planning to adopt countywide planning policies, in collaboration with the cities in the county. This opportunity provides for consistency amongst the comprehensive plans. The policies address issues that uniformly affect the county as a whole including transportation facilities, land use development, affordable housing, economic development and employment, historic preservation, and the siting of public facilities of a countywide or statewide nature.

The Lewis County Planned Growth Committee adopted updated planning policies in December 2006. These policies are statements establishing a framework from which the City's capital facilities element is developed. The requirements of the countywide planning policies were considered along with many other factors to determine the best course of action for the City of Centralia. The CWPPs are attached as Appendix C.

## II. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS

The following plans and documents relate to the development and implementation of the Capital Facilities Element (Plan). For more in-depth information on these subjects refer to the listed documents.

- **Lewis County Comprehensive Plan.** The Lewis County Comprehensive Plan was adopted in April, 2002.
- **Port of Centralia Comprehensive Plan.** The current Port Comprehensive Plan was adopted in November 1990 and revised in November 1994, September 1996, March 2003, and in September 2006.
- **City of Centralia Water Plan.** The Water Plan was adopted in December 2005
- **Surface/Storm Water Management Plan.** The Storm Water Management Plan should be adopted in winter of 2007 or spring of 2008.
- **General Sewer Plan and Wastewater Treatment Plant Facilities Plan.** The Plan was approved and adopted in the Spring of 2000.

- 
- **City Light and the Yelm Project Comprehensive Plan.** The City Light Plan was approved in December 2002.
  - **Airport Master Plan/Chehalis-Centralia.** The Airport Master Plan was approved Fall 2001.
  - **Parks and Recreation Plan.** The Parks and Recreation Plan (Element)
  - **Transportation Plan.** The Transportation Plan (Element)
  - **Downtown Centralia Revitalization Plan, Phase I.** The Phase I Revitalization Plan was approved in June 2003.
  - **Downtown Centralia Revitalization Plan, Phase II.** The Phase II Revitalization Plan was approved in October 12, 2004
  - **Centralia School District Capital Facilities Plan.** The Capital Facilities Plan for the Centralia School District should be approved in the summer/fall of 2007.
  - **Centralia College Master Plan.** The Centralia College Master Plan was approved on September 2002.
  - **Solid Waste Management Plan.** The Plan was approved by the County Commissioners in April 2000.
  - **Transit Development Plan.** The Transit Development Plan 2007-2012 was approved March 2007.

The above resources should be consulted for information on capital facility inventories, planning, and programming. The following documents have been reviewed and taken into consideration during the development of the Capital Facilities Element. These are considered to be "functional plans." They are intended to be more detailed often noting technical specifications and standards. They are designed to be an implementation tool rather than a policy guiding document.

### III. INTRODUCTION

One of the more challenging aspects in managing growth is ensuring that needed public facilities are available when growth occurs. The implementation of a well-defined capital facilities plan (CFP) will help realize the community's vision of a well-managed city. The ultimate full development of the Land Use Plan is contingent on the development of needed infrastructure in a timely and orderly fashion.

The purpose of this element is to demonstrate that all capital facilities serving Centralia have been addressed and that capital facility planning has been, and continues to be, conducted for all capital facilities. This element acts as a reference to all the various capital facility plans, comprehensive plans, capital improvement and investment programs, inventories, and studies that together represent the planning and financing mechanisms required to serve the capital facility needs of Centralia. The actual construction of these improvements will be determined on a year-to-year basis as part of the City budget process.

One aspect of managing growth in the City of Centralia is ensuring that needed public facilities, infrastructure, services, and financing are available when growth occurs. The

---

implementation of a well thought-out plan for public infrastructure will help Centralia realize its vision. Implementation of the City's land use plan is contingent on the development of needed infrastructure in a timely and orderly fashion as well as being in the position to finance the improvements.

#### **IV. PROVIDE AN ADEQUATE LEVEL OF SERVICE**

The City of Centralia has established a level of service (LOS) for each of the various public services that it provides. The GMA requires a level of service analysis for public facilities that is tied to growth. The importance of the level of service analysis lies in highlighting the relationship between the comprehensive plan elements and the Capital Facilities Plan.

Level of service is a quantifiable measure of public facilities provided to the community. It also measures the quality of some public facilities. Typically, measures of LOS are expressed as ratios of facility capacity to demand (i.e. actual or potential users).

To develop the LOS, the City has selected the way in which it will measure each facility (i.e. acres, gallons, etc.), and it identifies the LOS to be employed for each urban service included in the element.

The adopted LOS standards are utilized in two ways: 1) to determine the scope for capital improvement projects; and 2) to serve as a "benchmark" for testing the adequacy of public facilities for proposed developments.

As community values and desires change, adjustments will likely be needed. In addition, funding levels will fluctuate. Level of service standards may be modified depending upon priorities for improvements. Also, new standards may be needed for other facility types. The challenge is to balance the need for reliability (i.e., that development can depend on the timely provision of facilities or services) while being responsive to changing conditions.

The use of one LOS measurement for facility performance is a very limited approach. A LOS standard is usually more complex than a single calculation. However, it is one indicator of how well the City is doing in providing facilities as growth occurs. The use of the LOS measurements should not exclude additional qualitative analysis using other goals and policies.

LOS standards are not created in a vacuum. They are not rigid standards that must be maintained in all circumstances. They are a part of an on-going process that includes such factors as a community's population, economics and fiscal resources, as well as the demand for growth.

Once an LOS standard has been established, the performance of a capital facility can be measured. A capital facility operating at or above the established LOS indicates no need for improvements or new facilities. A facility operating below the established LOS might be an indication of a need for improvements or new facilities; however, if the level of satisfaction

among the service recipients is high, an evaluation and adjustment of the stated LOS may be appropriate.

The following chart illustrates the LOS measurements for the City.

<b>Level of Service (LOS) Measurements</b>	
<b>General Administration</b>	1,210 sq. ft. per 1,000 population
<b>Fire</b>	5-minute response 90% of the time
<b>Police</b>	1.94 officers per 1,000 population
<b>Library</b>	One full-time staff per 2,204 residents, one part-time per 2,571 residents
<b>City Light</b>	150% of Peak Demand
<b>Parks &amp; Recreation: Parks</b>	8.5 acres/1,000 population; Dist. ½ mile radius
<b>Parks &amp; Recreation: Natural Areas</b>	6 acres/ 1,000 population
<b>Parks &amp; Recreation: Trails</b>	1.5 miles/ 1,000 population; Dist. 1 mile
<b>Roads and Streets</b>	Transportation Level D
<b>Solid Waste</b>	Weekly collection
<b>Water</b>	Uniform Fire Code/Fire Flow
<b>Wastewater (sewer)</b>	120 gallons/person/day
<b>Stormwater</b>	25-year storm/Post contr. Flow = Pre-construction flow

## V. CONCURRENCY REQUIREMENTS

As stated above, the level of service is tied directly to planning for growth. The concurrency requirement in the Growth Management Act mandates that capital facilities be coordinated with new development or redevelopment. The City has determined that roads, electric, water, stormwater, and sewer facilities must be available concurrent with new development or redevelopment. This means that adequate capital facilities have to be finished and in place before, at the time, or within a reasonable time period (depending on the type of capital facility needed) following the impacts of development. Where it is not possible or feasible for the City to accommodate new development, approval should be delayed until such time as adequate services can be provided. Adequate capital facilities are those facilities which have the capacity to serve the development without decreasing the adopted levels of service for the community below accepted standards.

The concurrency requirement is not intended to be a "pass/fail" test that stops development. Rather, it is a benchmark for determining the extent to which development must address the impacts that it creates on selected public facilities: water, sewer, stormwater, electric and transportation. Where significant impact on public facilities is anticipated, the developer should be given an opportunity to mitigate that impact.

## VI. FUNDING OPTIONS

Financing a capital facilities plan is a complex issue. Anticipating the availability of financial resources to fund projects in the future cannot be accomplished with any degree of certainty.

Nonetheless, an analysis of what resources appear to be available for such long term purposes is needed since most of the projects listed would be considered long term and will have a significant impact on future resources. The actual construction of these improvements will be determined on a year-to-year basis as part of the City budget process. This section will provide the “best guess” as to how the long-range capital needs of the City of Centralia might be financed.

Its purpose is to provide information for more detailed budgetary decisions and not to prescribe a specific course of action. It is anticipated the City will utilize a number of methods to finance the projects listed in the CFP. Below is a sampling of some of these revenue sources.

### **Revenue Sources – General Government**

*General Fund*—The funds obtained from this source would be taken from the general fund account, which is derived from the general tax base of the City. Over-committing this fund may cause shortages for other needed facilities or raise taxes for the citizens of the community.

*Grant Funds*—There is a number of grant and loan programs available on a federal and state level. These programs can fluctuate substantially from year to year and should be viewed as an added bonus if secured, but not as the sole funding source.

*Utility Taxes*—Cities are authorized to impose taxes on utility services. Legislative maximums limit the amount of tax that may be collected to six (6%) percent for electricity, natural gas, and telephone. For example, the maximum tax rate for natural gas is six percent. Maximums may be exceeded for a specific purpose and time period with majority voter approval. There is no legislative limit on city provided water, wastewater or stormwater utilities.

*Sales Tax*—Washington law authorizes the governing bodies of cities and counties to impose sales and use taxes at a rate set by the statute to help "carry out essential county and municipal purposes." The authority is divided into two parts. Cities and counties may impose by resolution or ordinance a sales and use tax at a rate of five-tenths of one percent on any "taxable event" within their jurisdictions. Cities and counties may also impose an additional sales tax at a rate "up to" five-tenths of one percent on any taxable event within the City or county. In this case, the statute provides an electoral process for repealing the tax or altering the rate.

*Revenue Bonds*— Revenue bonds are sold with the intent of paying principal and interest from revenue generated by the improvement, such as fees and charges. For example, revenue bonds might be sold to fund a public water system that will generate revenue through utility charges to customers. Other funds may be dedicated to assist with repayment; however, it is desirable to have the improvements generate adequate revenue to pay all bond costs. Limits on the use and amount of revenue bonds are generally

---

market-driven through investor faith in the adequacy of the revenue stream to support bond payments.

*General Obligation Bonds*—Municipal borrowing to be repaid with future general taxes (voted and non-voted). For the purposes of funding capital projects, such as land acquisitions or facility construction, cities and counties have the authority to borrow money by selling bonds. Voter-approved general obligation bonds may be sold only after receiving a 60 percent majority vote at a general or special election. If approved, an excess property tax is levied each year for the life of the bond to pay both principal and interest. Centralia has a maximum debt limits for voter-approved bonds of two and one-half percent of the value of taxable property in the City. The City has an additional two and one-half percent for municipal water, sewer and lighting facilities, and an additional two and one-half percent for acquisition and development of open space and park facilities.

*Councilmanic Bonds*—Councilmanic bonds may be sold by cities and counties without public vote. The bonds—both principal and interest—are retired with payments from existing county or city revenue or new general tax revenue, such as additional sales tax or real estate excise tax. For both cities and counties, the Legislature has set a maximum debt limit for councilmanic bonds of one and one-half percent of the value of taxable property in the City or county, respectively.

*Excess Levy*—Washington law allows cities and counties, along with other specified junior taxing districts, to levy property taxes in excess of limitations imposed by statute when authorized by the voters. Levy approval requires 60 percent majority vote at a general or special election. Excess levies by school districts are the most common use of this authority.

*Impacts Fees*—The City has not developed and adopted impact fees for utilities, open space, parks and trails, schools and transportation. Impact fees can be developed to ensure the developer is only being assessed for their fair share of the growth. Development impact fees are charges placed on new development as a condition of development approval to help pay for various public facilities the need for which is directly created by that new growth and development. Under the Growth Management Act of 1990 (ESHB 2929), counties, cities, and towns may impose impact fees on residential and commercial "development activity" to help pay for certain public facility improvements, including parks, open space, and recreation facilities.

*Developer Funds*—The use of developer funds in either the form of cash contributions or constructed improvements is a major portion of the CFP.

*Water, Sewer, and Electric and Stormwater Funds*—These revenue accounts may be used to fund those projects falling under the applicable utility.

*Special Assessment (LID/ULID)*—The City can also use the Local Improvement District (LID), Utility Local Improvement District (ULID) and State Environmental Policy Act

(SEPA) process when applicable and appropriate. Local Improvement Districts are created under the sponsorship of the City and are not self governing special purpose districts. The capital project must directly benefit those properties that are assessed, and there must be a relationship between the benefit received and the assessment paid. Typically, these districts fund improvements to sewer, water or road systems through bonds that are subsequently paid back from special assessments that are levied on district members. LIDs are initiated by petition or by the resolution of intention method. LIDs are usually spread over a 10 to 20 year time frame. Specific legislation covers use and operation of repayment of various LIDs.

*Public Works Trust Fund*—Low interest State loan fund for infrastructure improvements.

*Real Estate Excise Tax (REET)*—a ½ of 1% excise tax on the sale of property required to finance public capital facilities.

*State Revolving Fund (SRF)*—Sources of money for this program include federal (DOE and EPA) and state funds. Since federal funds are involved, projects must comply with all the federal requirements. All 15-20 year loans will be assessed at an interest rate of 75% of the market rate, 6-14 year loans at 60% of market rate, and zero percent for loans 5 years or less.

*System development Charge (SDC)*—Water and Sewer Capital Project fund established from connection fees charged for new water and sewer connections. Designated for system expansion projects.

*Surface Transportation Act (STP)*—Federal gasoline taxes available to finance urban road and bridge improvements. 13.5% matching required on most projects.

*Transportation Improvement Board (TIB)/Transportation Improvement Account (TLA)*—State grant fund for major arterial street improvements.

*Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)*—Federal entitled funds disbursed throughout the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. These funds are intended to develop viable urban communities by providing decent housing and a suitable living environment, and by expanding economic opportunities, principally for low and moderate income persons.

### ***Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Trails***

*Inter-agency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC)*— Washington State Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation. The IAC was created in 1964 as part of the Marine Recreation Land Act (Initiative 215). The IAC grants money to state and local agencies, generally on a matching basis, to acquire, develop, and enhance wildlife habitat and outdoor recreation properties. Some money is also distributed for planning grants. IAC grant programs utilize funds from various sources. Historically, these have included the federal Land and Water Conservation Fund, state bonds, Initiative 215 monies (derived from unreclaimed marine fuel taxes), off-road vehicle funds, Youth Athletic Facilities

---

Account, and the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program. Funds are awarded to local agencies on a matching basis.

*Conservation Futures*— The Conservation Futures levy is provided for in Chapter 84.34 of the Revised Code of Washington. Boards of County Commissioners may impose by resolution a property tax of up to 6¼ cents per \$1,000 assessed valuation for the purpose of acquiring interest in open space, farm, and timber lands. Conservation Futures funds may be used for acquisition purposes only. Funds may be used to acquire mineral rights, and leaseback agreements are permitted. The statute prohibits the use of eminent domain to acquire property.

*Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA)*—Washington State Department of Natural Resources. This program provides matching grants to state and local agencies to protect and enhance salmon habitat and to provide public access and recreation opportunities on aquatic lands. In 1998, DNR refocused the ALEA program to emphasize salmon habitat preservation and enhancement. However, the program is still open to traditional water access proposals. Any project must be located on navigable portions of waterways. ALEA funds are derived from the leasing of state owned aquatic lands and from the sale of harvest rights for shellfish and other aquatic resources.

*Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP)*—Washington State Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC) The IAC is a state office that allocates funds to local and state agencies for the acquisition and development of wildlife habitat and outdoor recreation properties. Funding sources managed by the IAC include the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program. The WWRP is divided into Habitat Conservation and Outdoor Recreation Accounts; these are further divided into several project categories. Cities, counties, and other local sponsors may apply for funding in urban wildlife habitat, local parks, trails, and water access categories. Certain state agencies may also apply for funding in natural areas, critical habitat, and state parks categories. Funds for local agencies are awarded on a matching basis. Grant applications are evaluated once each year. However, in 1999, the IAC limited project review in odd-numbered years to local park acquisition. The State Legislature must authorize funding for the WWRP project lists.

*Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP)*—Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). The WRP provides landowners the opportunity to preserve, enhance, and restore wetlands and associated uplands. The program is voluntary and provides three enrollment options: permanent easements, 30-year easements, and 10-year restoration cost-share agreements. In all cases, landowners retain the underlying ownership in the property and management responsibility. Land uses may be allowed that are compatible with the program goal of protecting and restoring the wetlands and associated uplands. The NRCS manages the program and may provide technical assistance.

---

*Water Resources Development Act Environmental Restoration Programs and Authorities*— U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers provides funds for environmental and/or ecosystem restoration projects under provisions of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA), as amended. Section 306 of the WRDA of 1990 specifically authorizes environmental restoration as one of the primary missions of the Corps. Environmental and/or ecosystem restoration projects are intended to “improve the condition of a disturbed ecosystem, including its plant and animal communities, or portions thereof, to some prior ecological condition.” Various authorities and programs are

established for these purposes. These include General Investigation Studies and “Continuing Authorities” under Sections 206 (’96), 1135 (’86), and 204 (’92) of the WRDA. Generally, projects require the support of a local sponsoring organization and some level of cost sharing is required. The federal share on Continuing Authorities may range as high as \$5 million. For General Investigations there is no per project cost limit.

*Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)*—United States Department of Agriculture – Farm Service Agency. The Conservation Reserve Program provides annual rental payments and cost-share assistance to help preserve and enhance sensitive habitat areas on qualifying agricultural lands. The program, established in 1986, is voluntary. Lands enrolled in the CRP must be used for riparian buffers, filter strips, shallow water areas for wildlife, or other uses that provide beneficial habitat values. Landowners enter into agreements that last 10 to 15 years. Unlike the 1998 CREP, the CRP is not limited to stream areas that support salmon runs listed under the federal Endangered Species Act.

*Washington Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP)*—United States Department of Agriculture – Farm Service Agency. This program is a federal/state partnership, authorized in 1998, that involves the retirement of farmland for conservation purposes. Washington CREP focuses on the preservation and restoration of riparian habitat that supports salmon listed under the Endangered Species Act. This voluntary program provides financial incentives to farmers and ranchers to remove lands from agricultural production. Eligible landowners enter into agreements for periods of 10 to 15 years. Landowners receive an annual rental payment and cost-sharing is available for habitat enhancements. The federal Farm Service Agency is the primary administrative agency.

*Trust Lands Transfer Program*—Washington State Department of Natural Resources. This program provides a mechanism to protect DNR-managed properties with significant natural, park, or recreational attributes while infusing money into the public school construction fund. The program has been in effect since 1989. The program identifies “common school trust lands” with significant park, recreation, and natural features, which are difficult to manage as income-producing properties for trust beneficiaries and transfers them to more appropriate ownership. The Legislature appropriates funds to “buy out” these properties from the School Trust Program. Revenues equal to the timber value on subject properties are placed in the Common School Construction Account, while the timber is not harvested. The Legislature also provides for the replacement of the land by

---

appropriating the land value of the property to purchase other real property having better income potential for trust beneficiaries. The properties to be preserved may be transferred to local or state agencies. The selection process involves a detailed evaluation system. Key features include: 1) properties must have a high timber value to land value ratio; 2) properties must be of statewide significance for park, recreation, or natural area uses; and 3) the properties must have significant difficulties (e.g., sensitive wildlife habitat) in managing the property for income to trust beneficiaries.

*Jobs for the Environment (JFE)*—Washington State Department of Natural Resources. The JFE program was created by the state Legislature in 1993. The program promotes the longterm, stable employment of dislocated natural resource workers in the performance of watershed restoration activities. The program provides minimum funding commitments for salaries and benefits for displaced workers, and funding is also available for training. Since its inception, the program has completed many in-stream, riparian, and upland restoration projects. Entities eligible to apply for funding include state and local governments, tribes, and nonprofit organizations. Funding proposals will focus on limiting factors and recovery strategies within all or a portion of a Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA). Specific projects will then be identified, prepared, and approved for implementation over the life of the grant agreement.

*Forest Legacy Program*—Washington State Department of Natural Resources U.S. Forest Service. This program provides funds to acquire permanent conservation easements on private forestlands that are at risk of being converted to non-forest uses such as residential or commercial development. Congress established the program in 1990, and DNR is the lead state agency for the program in Washington State. The program is intended to preserve “working forests,” where forestlands are managed for the production of forest products and where traditional forest uses are encouraged. These uses will include both commodity production and non-commodity values such as healthy riparian areas, important scenic, aesthetic, cultural, fish, wildlife and recreation resources, and other ecological values. Historically, the program focus has been on the I-90 Highway Corridor east of Puget Sound within the Mountains-to-Sound Greenway area.

*Washington State Ecosystems Conservation Program (WSECP)*—U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). This WSECP was established in 1990 and is divided into federal- and state-managed components. The federal program focuses funds on projects that help restore habitat for threatened, endangered and sensitive species and, secondarily, for species of concern. In addition, the program attempts to concentrate funds within a limited number of watersheds to maximize program benefits. The program provides funds to cooperating agencies or organizations. These grants, in turn, can be distributed among project sites. The program requires a 50% cost-share from cooperating agencies, and individual landowners at project sites must enter into maintenance/management agreements that have a 10-year minimum duration.

---

*Washington State Ecosystems Conservation Program (WSECP) – Upland Wildlife Restoration Initiative*—Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife will purchase important upland habitat, or provide technical and/or financial assistance to protect, restore, or enhance such habitat on private property. The program emphasizes certain target species including pheasant, quail, and turkey, but also emphasizes protecting and enhancing habitats that support species diversity. The program covers the entire state, with an emphasis on eastern Washington. Private landowners who volunteer for this program enter into agreements that outline protection and maintenance programs. The program includes both agricultural and forestlands.

*Real Estate Excise Tax*—Local Conservation Areas Lewis County. Boards of County Commissioners may impose—with voter approval—an excise tax on each sale of real property in the county at rate not to exceed one percent of the selling price for the purpose of acquiring and maintaining conservation areas. The authorizing legislation defines conservation areas as "land and water that has environmental, agricultural, aesthetic, cultural, scientific, historic, scenic, or low-intensity recreational value for existing and future generations..." These areas include "open spaces, wetlands, marshes, aquifer recharge areas, shoreline areas, natural areas, and other lands and waters that are important to preserve flora and fauna."

*Other Financing Option* —Under many circumstances a project may be financed with a combination of the previous funding methods. The type of funding utilized will be described more fully on the project description list and also during the annual budgetary process. The funding source(s) assigned to projects is fairly simple. However, there were several projects that could easily use several of the funding sources. Therefore, the funding source assigned to those projects should be considered tentative and reevaluated as they approach their funding year.

## **VII. PROJECTIONS AND PRIORITIES FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS**

Balancing the need to maintain an adequate level of service with the demands of financing capital improvements is a difficult task. Clearly, certain capital improvements maintain a higher level of priority than others. It is the goal of the City to put together a viable, yet realistic Capital Facilities Plan which, when administered, will provide the necessary facilities and services to the citizens of the community.

The Capital Facilities Plan Project List (2007-2012) at the end of this chapter provides a listing of all projects that have been identified in various planning documents. The implementation dates listed for the projects are tentative and should be viewed as such, but said dates are invaluable as a long term planning tool. In addition to projected dates, each project has been given a priority level. This list will serve as a guide for future infrastructure improvements.

---

The CFP should be updated each year in order to incorporate capital improvements into the adopted annual budget. The actual construction of the listed improvements/projects will be determined on a year-to-year basis as part of the City budget process.

## **VII. PROJECTIONS AND PRIORITIES FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS**

### **General**

#### **Goal CF 1**

To insure that the Capital Facilities element is consistent with other city, local, regional and state adopted plans.

#### **Policies**

- CF 1.1** Reassess the Comprehensive Plan annually to ensure that capital facilities and utilities needs, financing and level of service are consistent, and that the plan is internally consistent.
- CF 1.2** Coordinate with non-City providers of public facilities on a joint program for maintaining adopted levels of service standards and concurrency requirements.
- CF 1.3** Provide all private utility companies on an annual basis with access to copies of the City's updated Capital Facilities Plan (with any specific scheduling information) so that opportunities for closer coordination of any construction activities can be realized.

### **Public Safety**

#### **Goal CF 2**

To provide fire protection, emergency medical services, and police service to the community through a cost-effective and efficient delivery system to maintain a safe environment for the public.

#### **Policies**

- CF 2.1** Encourage high standards of organization, training, and motivation for police, fire, and emergency personnel.
- CF 2.2** Promote support for the police and fire departments through citizen awareness programs.
- CF 2.3** Maintain high standards of fire protection in order to reduce fire insurance costs.
- CF 2.4** Enforce minimum fire and building codes and encourage repair or removal of dangerous structures.
- CF 2.5** Provide fire, emergency medical services, and police service to the public which maintain accepted standards as new development and annexations occur.

- 
- CF 2.6** Provide a system of streets which facilitates improved emergency response times.
  - CF 2.7** Develop and maintain a water system which provides adequate fire flow for anticipated development based on land use designation in the Comprehensive Plan.
  - CF 2.8** Ensure that safety and security considerations are factored into the review of development proposals.
  - CF 2.9** Develop and periodically update fire and police functional plans to remain consistent with the goals, policies, and land use projections of the Comprehensive Plan.

## **Parks and Recreation**

### **Goal CF 3**

To acquire, develop, and redevelop a system of parks, recreation facilities and open spaces that is attractive, safe, functional, and available to all segments of the population.

#### **Policies**

- CF 3.1** Park and open space acquisition, development, and redevelopment should be actively sought through a variety of methods.
- CF 3.2** Locate parks and open spaces in areas that are reasonably accessible to anticipated users.
- CF 3.3** Provide opportunities for passive and active recreation.
- CF 3.4** Provide parks and open spaces which fulfill the recreational needs of the City's residents.
- CF 3.5** Encourage the establishment of scenic routes for walking and cycling.
- CF 3.6** Parks or recreational facilities should be developed only when adequate maintenance and operation funding is available to maximize maintenance efficiency, safety, and public enjoyment.
- CF 3.7** Consider the development of a City-wide comprehensive tree plan which would include: (1) the selection of appropriate tree species for median strips, sidewalks, developed parks, and other publicly -owned landscaped areas; (2) maintenance guidelines; and (3) policies regarding the cutting, clearing or topping of trees in street right-of-way, developed parks, or natural areas.

### **Goal CF 4**

To increase the use and effectiveness of existing parks and other recreational facilities.

#### **Policies**

- CF 4.1** Cooperate with the Centralia School District, Lewis County, and the City of Chehalis to improve joint recreation facilities.
- CF 4.2** Provide parks and recreational facilities that help to define or solidify neighborhoods, such as neighborhood parks, playgrounds, and community centers.
- CP 4.3** Provide for public access in unique and/or important natural areas such as shorelines and forested area (including acquisition and integrate them into the park and open space systems.

**Goal CF 5**

To provide adequate recreational opportunities for City residents.

**Policies**

- CF 5.1** Provide for a wide range of recreational experiences based on system of water and shoreline areas, neighborhood parks and playfield, golf courses, historic sites, natural study areas, and open space plazas.
- CF 5.2** Recreational services should be provided on a user fee basis such that the primary beneficiaries share in for the cost of services.

**Capital Facilities**

**Goal CF 6**

To provide adequate public facilities that achieves and maintains the level of service standards for existing and future population.

**Policies**

**Sewer and Water Facilities**

- CF 6.1** Use an adopted level of service standards for determining the need for public sewer and water facilities.

**Transportation Facilities**

- CF 6.2** Use an adopted vehicular peak hour standard for the transportation sub-areas of the City:

**Other Public Facilities**

- CF 6.3** Use an adopted level of service standard to determine the need for public facilities:
- CF 6.4** Strive to achieve the adopted level of service standards for park and recreational facilities and open space preservation:
- CF 6.5** Provide the capital improvements listed in this Capital Facilities Plan needed to achieve and maintain standards adopted in this Plan.

While the City is responsible for its capital improvements program, in many cases, capital facilities are provided by others (such as the State or County, developers, or special districts). The City should coordinate the provision of these facilities in order to ensure that the levels of service identified in the Plan can be achieved.

**Concurrency**

**Goal CF 7**

To ensure that water, sewer, and transportation facilities necessary to support new development are available and adequate concurrent with the development, based upon the City's adopted level of service standards.

---

**Policies**

- CF 7.1** Evaluate each development permit to ensure that it will not cause the level of service of water, sewer, or transportation facilities to decline below the adopted standards.
- CF 7.2** Ensure levels of service for water and sewer are adequate no later than occupancy and use of new development. Water and sewer facilities are essential to public health therefore they must be available and adequate upon first use of development.

**Transportation**

- CF 7.3** Ensure levels of service for transportation facilities (roads, streets, and transit) are adequate no later than six (6) years after occupancy and use of new development.

The State's Growth Management Act allows up to six (6) years to achieve standards for transportation facilities because they do not threaten public health, and because they are very expensive, and are built in large "increments" (i.e., a section of road serves many users

- CF 7.4** Provide the following options for each development for which adequate public facilities are not available concurrent with the impacts of development:
- a. Mitigate all their impacts on levels of service; or
  - b. Revise the proposed development to reduce impacts to maintain satisfactory levels of service; or
  - c. Phase the development to coincide with the availability of increased water, sewer, and transportation facilities.
- CF 7.5** To ensure that transportation facilities are properly funded and analyzed including developing improvements or strategies the City will do the following:
- a. Develop a Concurrency Ordinance
  - b. Consider impact fees and other mitigation and funding options
  - c. Monitor key transportation facilities within update to the six-year Capital Facilities Plan
  - d. Annually evaluate the levels of service
  - e. Identify facility deficiencies
  - f. Review the Transportation Plan and other related studies for necessary improvements
  - g. Comply with HB 1487 and coordinate with WSDOT for planning transportation facilities and services of statewide significance

**CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN: WATER**  
**City of Centralia Capital Facilities Financing**  
**6-Year Water Projects (2007-2012)**

Sources/Uses	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	TOTAL
<b>SOURCES OF FUNDS</b>							
Rate Revenues	53,000	55,000	56,000	104,000	60,000	61,000	389,000
Capital Facility Charges	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Developers	0	0	0	700,000	0	500,000	1,200,000
Grants/Loans	0	0	1,450,000	1,000,000	545,000	1,283,000	4,278,000
<b>Total Sources</b>	<b>53,000</b>	<b>55,000</b>	<b>1,506,000</b>	<b>1,804,000</b>	<b>605,000</b>	<b>1,844,000</b>	<b>5,867,000</b>
<b>USES OF FUNDS</b>							
Reservoir Improvements:							
Davis Hill				1,400,000			1,400,000
Booster Pump Station							
Improvements: Davis Hill				300,000			300,000
Annual Pipe Repl. (WD-1)	53,000	55,000	56,000	58,000	60,000	61,000	343,000
Leak Detection (WD-2)				46,000			46,000
Line Upsizing and Additions:							
WD-13, WD-19, WD-20			1,450,000				1,450,000
WD-8					95,000		95,000
WD-6					450,000		450,000
WD-7						1,783,000	1,783,000
<b>Total Uses</b>	<b>53,000</b>	<b>55,000</b>	<b>1,506,000</b>	<b>1,804,000</b>	<b>605,000</b>	<b>1,844,000</b>	<b>5,867,000</b>
<b>Surplus or (Deficit)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Please see the City's Water System Plan Update 2005 for a detailed list of the improvement projects

**CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN: SEWER**  
**City of Centralia Capital Facilities Financing**  
**6-Year Sewer Projects (2007-2012)**

Sources/Uses	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	TOTAL
<b>SOURCES OF FUNDS</b>							
Rate Revenues	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Capital Facility Charges	3,412,788	0	0	0	0	0	3,412,788
Developers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grants/Loans	900,000	0	1,918,000	1,718,000	1,468,000	1,718,000	7,722,000
<b>Total Sources</b>	<b>4,312,788</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,918,000</b>	<b>1,718,000</b>	<b>1,468,000</b>	<b>1,718,000</b>	<b>11,134,788</b>
<b>USES OF FUNDS</b>							
N. Port Sewer	4,312,788						
Replacement of Aging Pipeline:							
7,000 In ft/Year	0	0	718,000	718,000	718,000	718,000	2,872,000
Logan District I & I Removal			1,200,000				1,200,000
Jefferson Street Pump Station Upgrade				1,000,000			1,000,000
Interceptor #1 Replacement							
Phase 1 (East of RR tracks)					750,000		750,000
Interceptor #1 Replacement							
Phase 2 (RR Crossing)						1,000,000	1,000,000
<b>Total Uses</b>	<b>4,312,788</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,918,000</b>	<b>1,718,000</b>	<b>1,468,000</b>	<b>1,718,000</b>	<b>11,134,788</b>
<b>Surplus or (Deficit)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Please see the City's General Sewer Plan 2000 for a detailed list of the improvement projects

**CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN: STORMWATER**  
**City of Centralia Capital Facilities Financing**  
**6-Year Storm & Surface Water Projects (2007-2012)**

Sources/Uses	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	TOTAL
<b>SOURCES OF FUNDS</b>							
Rate Revenues	20,000	70,000	0	0	0	0	90,000
Capital Facility Charges	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Developers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grants/Loans	0	230,000	300,000	550,000	730,000	630,000	2,440,000
<b>Total Sources</b>	<b>20,000</b>	<b>300,000</b>	<b>300,000</b>	<b>550,000</b>	<b>730,000</b>	<b>630,000</b>	<b>2,530,000</b>
<b>USES OF FUNDS</b>							
Sixth		230,000					230,000
Summa West & East			300,000				300,000
Tower				550,000			550,000
Center					730,000		730,000
Cherry						630,000	630,000
China Creek Modeling	20,000	70,000					90,000
<b>Total Uses</b>	<b>20,000</b>	<b>300,000</b>	<b>300,000</b>	<b>550,000</b>	<b>730,000</b>	<b>630,000</b>	<b>2,530,000</b>
<b>Surplus or (Deficit)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Please see the City's 2007 Stormwater Management Plan for a detailed description of the improvement projects

**CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN: ELECTRIC**  
**City of Centralia Capital Facilities Financing**  
**6-Year Electric Projects (2007-2012)**

Sources/Uses	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	TOTAL
<b>SOURCES OF FUNDS</b>							
Rate Revenues	275,600	162,240	168,730	175,479	500,000	500,000	1,782,049
Developers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bonds	9,010,340	6,694,624	725,591	6,203,400			22,633,955
<b>Total Sources</b>	<b>9,285,940</b>	<b>6,856,864</b>	<b>894,321</b>	<b>6,378,879</b>	<b>500,000</b>	<b>500,000</b>	<b>24,416,004</b>
<b>USES OF FUNDS</b>							
Powerhouse/Grounds Projects	530,400	432,640	534,365	584,930	250,000	250,000	2,582,335
Power Canal Project	1,092,000						1,092,000
Substation Program	3,432,000	1,946,880		3,275,603			8,654,483
Automated Metering Program	624,000	486,720					1,110,720
Broadband Over Power Lines	248,000	1,000,000					1,248,000
Acquire PUD Customers In UGA				1,091,118			1,091,118
Warehouse/Equipment Building Program	78,000	1,162,720					1,240,720
Reconductoring, Poles, Underground, Relocation Program	3,281,540	1,827,904	359,956	1,427,228	250,000	250,000	7,396,628
<b>Total Uses</b>	<b>9,285,940</b>	<b>6,856,864</b>	<b>894,321</b>	<b>6,378,879</b>	<b>500,000</b>	<b>500,000</b>	<b>24,416,004</b>
<b>Surplus or (Deficit)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Please see the City's Light and Yelm Project Comprehensive Plan and Bond Fund Project list for a detailed listing of the improvement projects

**CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN: TRANSPORTATION**  
**City of Centralia Capital Facilities Financing**  
**6-Year Transportation Projects (2007-2012)**

Sources/Uses	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	TOTAL
<b>SOURCES OF FUNDS</b>							
Capital Projects Fund		21,000	10,500	10,500	10,500	10,500	63,000
Grants/Donations			450,000	600,000	0	360,000	1,410,000
Bonds/Loans							0
WSDOT/Federal Funds	1,573,000	229,450,000	437,492,000	437,492,000	102,175,654	18,175,000	788,865,654
<b>Total Sources</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,594,000</b>	<b>229,910,500</b>	<b>438,102,500</b>	<b>102,186,154</b>	<b>18,545,500</b>	<b>790,338,654</b>
<b>USES OF FUNDS</b>							
F-1: Harrison Ave. truck route (signage)		10,500					10,500
F-2: Galvin truck route ext. (signage)				10,500			10,500
F-3: West Collector truck route (signage)			10,500				10,500
F-4: Harrison truck route ext. (signage)					10,500		10,500
F-5: Central truck route (signage)						10,500	10,500
F-6: Johnson truck route (signage)							10,500
C-R1: Airport road widening			29,000,000				29,000,000
C-R2: I-5-Blakeslee Junction to Grand Mound				197,000,000			197,000,000
C-R3: I-5 Mellen Street Interchange/NIM-6 sidewalk			197,000,000				197,000,000
C-R4: I-5 Mellen to Blakeslee Junction bridge				197,000,000			197,000,000
C-R5: West Collector (old Highway 99)					97,000,000		97,000,000
C-R6: Downing Road extension						15,100,000	15,100,000
C-R12: Scheuber & Cooks Hill road						2,500,000	2,500,000
I-1: Harrison/1st Intersection					250,000		250,000
I-2: Pearl/6th Intersection					250,000		250,000
I-3: Summa/Gold Intersection					250,000		250,000
I-4: Summa/Kresky Intersection					250,000		250,000
S-1: Belmont/Harrison Intersection							250,000
S-2: Harrison/I-5 Interchange			250,000				250,000
S-3: Main/Washington Intersection				250,000			250,000
NIM-1: Harrison bike route				20,000			20,000
NIM-2: Mellen bike route				20,000			20,000
NIM-3: Eshom Road sidewalk					650,654		650,654
NIM-4: Borst Avenue sidewalk				3,300,000			3,300,000



**CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN: PARKS AND RECREATION**  
**City of Centralia Capital Facilities Financing**  
**6-Year Parks Projects (2007-2012)**

Sources/Uses	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	TOTAL
<b>SOURCES OF FUNDS</b>							
General Fund		20,000	20,000	21,300	24,100		85,400
Grants/Donations		31,635	8,000	60,000	58,000	56,000	213,635
Park Improvement Fund		4,500		2,000		2,000	8,500
Borst Park Construction Fund		50,000		50,000		50,000	150,000
<b>Total Sources</b>	0	106,135	28,000	133,300	82,100	108,000	457,535

USES OF FUNDS	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	TOTAL
<b>USES OF FUNDS</b>							
FBP: Parks Building - tear off and replace roof		52,500					52,500
FBP: Borst Kitchen #2 - tear off and replace roof		18,000					18,000
FBP: Softball Complex - fencing repair and replacement		9,000					9,000
FBP: Ed Wheeler - repairs and upgrades		18,000					18,000
RRP: Restroom improvements		8,635					8,635
FBP: Parks Building - siding, windows and repaint				24,100	24,100		48,200
FBP: Borst Home - replace foundation timbers			28,000				28,000
FBP: Ed Wheeler - upgrade/repairs to field lighting				6,200			6,200
FBP: Tennis Courts - repair/replacement: cracks and resurface				35,000			35,000
RRP: Security lighting upgrades				43,000			43,000
BSP: Prepare park master plan				25,000			25,000
RRP: Playground improvements with ADA upgrades					33,000		33,000
WPP: Prepare park master plan					25,000		25,000
FBP: Borst Park - new group picnic shelter						75,000	75,000
FBP: Borst Park - playground improvements & ADA upgrades						33,000	33,000
<b>Total Uses</b>	0	106,135	28,000	133,300	82,100	108,000	457,535

<b>Surplus or (Deficit)</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

This page left blank intentionally